

Richfield Dairy Supplemental Environmental Assessment
Appendix of Comments

Section 1:

Comments of Dana Lynn Hanaman, Esquire.
Comments of Kestrel Management Services, LLC by Thomas P. Kunes, P.E.
Comments of Pleasant Lake Management District by Jean MacCubbin, President
Comments of Ms. Francie Rowe
Comments of Sierra Club—John Muir Chapter by Shahla M. Werner
Comments of Kenneth S. Wade, P.E., P.G..
Comments of Ray J. White, Ph. D..
Comments of McGillivray Westerberg & Bender LLC by Christa Westerberg, Esquire
Comments of George J. Kraft, Ph.D., P.H.
Comments of Michael Best & Friedrich LLP by David A. Crass, Esquire

Section 2:

Additional Comments

Section 3:

Additional Comments

From: [Sarah Parker](#)
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Subject: Re: Richfield Dairy Deep Well operation
Date: Sunday, January 06, 2013 6:32:53 AM

Ms. Greve,

There must be a balance between the needs of industry and the capacity that the land has to support those needs. I've grown up visiting the central sands region (30+ years now) every summer and fall and have seen the waters of the lake on which our families' homestead stands recede slowly, but progressively, that entire time. It's to the point now that we have essentially lost the beach we once had at the end of our lake, and several smaller ponds in our area are completely dry. I sympathize with the needs of farmers to obtain water for their crops and livestock, but there must be a balance - or at least an honest recognition by the DNR of the impact these events will have on the waters of the region. To deny such an impact is an insult to the people who live here and see with their own eyes the changes caused by the continual growth of industrial sized farming operations in our area.

As such, I want to express my deep concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy.

I am specifically concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche a Cri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and Tagatz Creek as well as Pleasant Lake. I am troubled by the potential impact to Little Roche a Cri and Fordham Creeks which are both Exceptional Resource Waters, and Chaffee and Tagatz Creeks which are Outstanding Resource Waters. The wells also will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake which has already been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern.

Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that no **significant** impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. This is not logical. In light of all other evidence, and in combination of the many other wells in the area, **significant** is a matter of interpretation. As an individual who enjoys the use of these waters, these impacts are in fact significant!

While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is one of profound disappointment. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state.

I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

Sincerely,

Sarah Parker, PhD
Post Doctoral Fellow
Division of Cardiology & The Bayview Proteomics Center
Johns Hopkins University
5200 Eastern Av. Mason F Lord building,
Center Tower, Room 607
Baltimore, MD 21224
phone 410-550-8507
fax 410-550-8512

From: thnderbd88@aol.com
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Cc: bclarke113@yahoo.com; njc123@aol.com
Subject: Richfield CAFO
Date: Monday, January 07, 2013 3:00:32 PM

Dear Rachel,

I want to express my concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy. The wells will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake which has already been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern.

Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state. I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

I am troubled that the Wisconsin DNR, who has always been extremely protective of their lakes and waterways, would even consider allowing one of our precious resources to be depleted and dried up. The studies are out there.

Please consider the families, that for decades have come to Wisconsin to enjoy the natural beauty, resources and hospitality. Please consider rejecting pumping permits for Richfield Dairy to save Pleasant Lake and our environment.

Thanks for your consideration in this matter,
Dave Spataro

From: [Jessica Parker Garvin](#)
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Subject: Richfield Dairy
Date: Monday, January 07, 2013 6:13:11 AM

I am an annual visitor to the area that will be affected by the Richfield Dairy and I am terribly concerned about the detriment to the ecosystem if it were to go forward. Our area can not withstand such a strain on the water supply.

Thank you.

Jessica Parker Garvin
Descendant of Hannah and Able Parker, original homesteaders of the Fish Lake area

From: [Jenifer Horne](#)
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Subject: Richfield Dairy CAFO Comment
Date: Monday, January 07, 2013 6:06:15 PM

Dear Department of Natural Resources,

I am deeply concerned by the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy. Specifically, I'm concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche aCri, Fordham, Chaffee, and Tagatz Creeks as well as Pleasant Lake. I am seriously troubled by the potential destructive impact to Little Roche a Cri and Fordham Creeks which are both Exceptional Resource Waters, and Chaffee and Tagatz Creeks which are Outstanding Resource Waters. The wells will also have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake which has already been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years, most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands.

The impact to the wetlands Northwest of the site is also of grave concern. Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY, and yet the DNR states that *no significant impact* would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. In light of all other evidence, and in combination of the many other wells in the area, *significant* is a matter of interpretation. As a loved one of an individual property owner who enjoys the use of these waters, these impacts are in fact significant!

While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is profoundly disappointing. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state. I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

Thank you for considering my opinion and our wonderful state.

Sincerely,

Jenifer Horne

From: [James Friedrich](#)
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Cc: jclarke@furstgroup.com; [Scott Froehlke](#)
Subject: Richfield Dairy CAFO wells
Date: Sunday, January 06, 2013 9:23:09 AM

I am writing regarding the high-cap wells proposed for the Richfield Dairy CAFO. I worked for WDNR in this area for 16 years and have good grasp of the situation and the resource.

Given the vast pumping already taking place in the Wisconsin central sands area, and that we are currently in serious drought, the ***cumulative impact*** of the Richfield CAFO wells needs to be considered. This how WDNR plans to evaluate the proposed Golden Sands CAFO wells in the Town of Saratoga, and the situation is very similar for the Richfield CAFO. There are already many water resources adversely impacted in the central sands area, and acknowledged experts (such as George Kraft from UW-Stevens Point) recognize the fallacy of studying these wells individually, rather than in total.

For WDNR to ignore the cumulative impact of the combined well pumping defies both science and common sense. The primary mission of WDNR is to protect the resource, not to grease the wheels of ill conceived ag industry.

Jim Friedrich
Retired WDNR Wastewater Specialist/Residuals Regulator
Wisconsin Rapids Service Center

From: [Kevin Kratzke](#)
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Subject: Richfield Dairy Comments
Date: Sunday, January 06, 2013 11:06:23 PM

Dear Ms. Greve,

I am writing this e-mail in support of the comments you received requesting monitoring of the land application areas of the wastes generated by Richfield Dairy. On page 87 of the RichfieldDairyComments.pdf (Permit Changes and Response to Comments, Richfield Dairy, WPDES Permit No. WI-0064815-01-0), the following is stated:

A number of comments requested that if the Department issues the WPDES permit, groundwater monitoring should be required for the production area and/or land application areas. Reasons for requiring the monitoring included (1) the sandy nature of soils in the area that make it susceptible to groundwater contamination, (2) high groundwater, (3) the high quality of water resources in the area and (4) the size of the operation included the large number of acres where manure will be land spread. Requested parameters to be monitored included (1) water table height to ensure the proposed withdrawal is not adversely impacting adjacent surface waters or private wells, (2) bacteria and nutrients to ensure contamination of the groundwater is not occurring as a result of the proposed manure spreading.

Response: The Department does not regulate water quantity issues and impacts to private wells as part of the WPDES permit. The Department has not required groundwater monitoring at land application sites due to the complexity and ineffectiveness of requiring such monitoring (e.g., what if a permittee never land applies manure on the field where groundwater monitoring wells have been installed or only applies minimal amounts of manure to the field being monitored?). The Department does not have authority to require groundwater monitoring of private wells. In lieu of groundwater monitoring at land application sites, the permit relies on the implementation of best management practices. Regarding groundwater monitoring within the production area, reference response to comments #2 and #3.

The Department is incorrect to rely on implementation of best management practices in lieu of monitoring to assess compliance with groundwater objectives. Considering the geology of the area, compliance with standard operation methods is not a guarantee that water quality standards will not be exceeded in the application areas. Your department argues "What if a permittee never land applies manure on the field where groundwater monitoring wells have been installed or only applies minimal amounts of manure to the field being monitored?" This assumes monitoring can only consist of monitoring wells and that pre and post monitoring is necessary. An alternative monitoring method is available.

Because the groundwater is shallow and the soil sandy and therefore has a rapid percolation rate in many areas, a reasonable alternative would be to monitoring the groundwater using direct push sampling (Geoprobe or similar) of the fields that receive the highest application rates of manure with comparison with background fields having no or low application rates and of similar geology. Not every field need be tested. A representative selection of fields can be selected annually with the results included in the annual monitoring report. Monitoring parameters would be those as listed in Section 2.1 of the WPDES permit. Different fields can be monitored each year depending on the application rates for the prior year (impacted fields should be retested) and and relative risk pf a given field.

I also believe drug usage should be monitored at the facility. Drugs often pass through to animal excrement and are subsequently disbursed on the ground and in waters of the State via the facility's waste disposal practices.

The larger the CAFO, the more need for frequent drug usage to limit disease at the facility. At a minimum, Richfield Dairy should be required to report all prescription drug usage at the site. In addition, solid and liquid manure should be analyzed for the active ingredients in the drugs to determine the quantity of the drugs that are being passed to the environment.

If the Wisconsin DNR cannot include these requirements in the current permit, they should, at a minimum, be included in the subsequent permit.

Regards,

Kevin Kratzke
Montello, WI

From: [Caitlin Keenan](#)
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Subject: Richfield dairy permit IMPORTANT!
Date: Monday, January 07, 2013 12:16:00 PM

Ms. Greve,

I want to express my deep concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy.

I am specifically concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche a Cri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and Tagatz Creek as well as Pleasant Lake. I am troubled by the potential impact to Little Roche a Cri and Fordham Creeks which are both Exceptional Resource Waters, and Chaffee and Tagatz Creeks which are Outstanding Resource Waters. The wells also will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake which has already been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern.

Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that no **significant** impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. This is not logical. In light of all other evidence, and in combination of the many other wells in the area, **significant** is a matter of interpretation. As an individual who enjoys the use of these waters, these impacts are in fact significant!

While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is one of profound disappointment. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state.

I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

Sincerely,

Caitlin Keenan

From: jayne@teamlblonde.com
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Subject: Richfield Dairy Permit
Date: Monday, January 07, 2013 8:27:32 AM

Ms. Greve,

I want to express my deep concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy.

I am specifically concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche a Cri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and Tagatz Creek as well as Pleasant Lake. I am troubled by the potential impact to Little Roche a Cri and Fordham Creeks which are both Exceptional Resource Waters, and Chaffee and Tagatz Creeks which are Outstanding Resource Waters. The wells also will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake which has already been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern.

Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that no significant impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. This does not make any sense.

While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is one of profound disappointment. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state.

I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

Jayne Ertel

From: [Nance Longley](#)
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Subject: Richfield Dairy Permit
Date: Monday, January 07, 2013 3:34:53 PM

Ms. Greve,

I want to express my deep concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy.

I am specifically concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche a Cri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and Tagatz Creek as well as Pleasant Lake. I am troubled by the potential impact to Little Roche a Cri and Fordham Creeks which are both Exceptional Resource Waters, and Chaffee and Tagatz Creeks which are Outstanding Resource Waters. The wells also will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake which has already been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern.

Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that no *significant* impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. This is not logical. In light of all other evidence, and in combination of the many other wells in the area, *significant* is a matter of interpretation. As an individual who enjoys the use of these waters, these impacts are in fact significant!

While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is one of profound disappointment. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state.

I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

Sincerely,

Nance Parker Longley

co-owner of a cottage on Fish Lake, Deerfield Township, on property that my great, great grandparents Abel and Hannah Parker homesteaded in 1848.

From: [Russ Clark](#)
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Subject: Richfield Dairy Permit
Date: Sunday, January 06, 2013 8:00:19 AM

Ms. Greve,

I want to express my deep concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy.

I am specifically concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche a Cri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and Tagatz Creek as well as Pleasant Lake. I am troubled by the potential impact to Little Roche a Cri and Fordham Creeks which are both Exceptional Resource Waters, and Chaffee and Tagatz Creeks which are Outstanding Resource Waters. The wells also will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake which has already been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern.

Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that no **significant** impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. This is not logical. In light of all other evidence, and in combination of the many other wells in the area, **significant** is a matter of interpretation. As an individual who enjoys the use of these waters, these impacts are in fact significant!

While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is one of profound disappointment. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state.

I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

Sincerely,

Heidi Vance

From: [steve halvorsen](#)
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Subject: Richfield dairy well
Date: Sunday, January 06, 2013 10:16:27 AM

Please do whatever you can to either deny the permit for this high cap well or place restrictions on its capacity to remove our groundwater. There are already too many of the wells in the Central Sands and coupled with our current drought they are lowering the lake levels in the area and affecting stream flows or drying them up altogether.

Thankyou,

Steve Halvorsen.

Property owner on Pleasant Lake.

From: [Richard Parker](#)
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Subject: Richfield Dairy wells
Date: Sunday, January 06, 2013 12:01:43 PM

Ms. Greve,

I'm a fifth-generation member of a family that homesteaded in central Wisconsin shortly before Wisconsin became a state. I live in Minnesota now, but our extended family still has part of the old Parker farm on the shore of Fish Lake near Hancock in Waushara County. A number of my relatives live in Wisconsin, some of them in newer homes on property near our shore parcel. I've been coming to the lake literally all my life and have watched the level go up and down; it's now alarmingly low after a slide of several years, the lowest I've ever seen it. I'm 70.

Neighboring farmers don't agree with me, but I suspect that the water table in our area is stressed by the high volume of irrigation by the large farms that have increased in number over recent decades. I realize that the area's economy needs a boost, but I don't want that to come at a long-term cost to everyone.

So I'm joining others from the area in passing along the following letter urging the Department of Natural Resources to protect our water resources from commercial activity that would have a harmful effect:

I want to express my deep concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy.

I am specifically concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche a Cri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and Tagatz Creek as well as Pleasant Lake. I am troubled by the potential impact to Little Roche a Cri and Fordham Creeks which are both Exceptional Resource Waters, and Chaffee and Tagatz Creeks which are Outstanding Resource Waters. The wells also will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake which has already been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern.

Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that no **significant** impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. This is not logical. In light of all other evidence, and in combination of the many other wells in the area, **significant** is a matter of interpretation. As an individual who enjoys the use of these waters, these impacts are in fact significant!

While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is one of profound disappointment. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state.

I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable

significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

Sincerely,

Richard Parker
W11803 County GG
Hancock, WI 54943

1358 W. Skillman Ave.
Roseville, MN 55113

From: [Jim Schafer](#)
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Subject: Richfield Dairy
Date: Sunday, January 06, 2013 6:22:20 PM

Rachel:

I have been a Pleasant Lake cottage for almost 20 years. It is a beautiful small lake in the middle of Wisconsin. The water is clean and we are working hard to keep it that way. Over the time since we purchased our property, the lake level has dropped over 2 feet when. The deep wells that have been approved by the DNR over the time we have been involved with our lake have contributed greatly to our problem. In the past 10 years, the DNR has approved wells with a pumping capacity greater than 70 gpm. The DNR continues to permit wells in areas surrounding counties that add to our concerns with water table. It has been projected by Hydrologist's that our lake could fall another 2 feet or more.

We used to brag about our lake but now have to answer questions about how low can it go and will you be able to sell your property if the lake level continues to go down. People are worried about their personal water supply and if our wells will go dry. If you can't guarantee us that the level of Pleasant Lake won't drop further and our wells won't go dry, please stop the abuse that your continuing permits are contributing to.

Thank you for listening.

Jim and Barb Schafer
Pleasant Lake Residents

From: [David Drengenberg](#)
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Subject: Richfield Dairy
Date: Monday, January 07, 2013 8:37:18 AM

I would like to express my concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy. I'm concerned for the Little roche aCri creek, Fordham creek, Chaffee creek, Tagatz creek and Pleasant lake. As has been shown by many studies the high capacity wells will effect all of these bodies of water and once they have been damaged it will be very difficult, if not impossible to reverse the damage. Please consider the at the minimum taking more time to investigate the true effects these high capacity wells will have on the environment. As an individual property owner who enjoys this treasure of Wisconsin environment I hope you will take some time to review the impact of these wells.

Thank you, David and Debra Drengenberg

From: [Mandy Brown](#)
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Subject: Richfield Dairy
Date: Monday, January 07, 2013 1:38:31 PM

Ms. Greve,

I want to express my deep concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy. I am specifically concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche a Cri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and Tagatz Creek as well as Pleasant Lake. I am troubled by the potential impact to Little Roche a Cri and Fordham Creeks which are both Exceptional Resource Waters, and Chaffee and Tagatz Creeks which are Outstanding Resource Waters. The wells also will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake which has already been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern. Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that no significant impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. This is not logical. In light of all other evidence, and in combination of the many other wells in the area, significant is a matter of interpretation. As an individual who enjoys the use of these waters, these impacts are in fact significant! While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is one of profound disappointment. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state. I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

Sincerely,

[Mandy Brown](#)

From: [Mary Kay \(Noble\) Spataro](#)
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#); bclarke113@yahoo.com
Subject: Richfield Dairy
Date: Monday, January 07, 2013 2:27:41 PM

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing this letter to you feeling a sense of urgent concern and despair. You really need to "see" with eyes wide open and "listen" to people with ears wide open, to the concerns of so many of us who have enjoyed the proposed Richfield Dairy area through the years with their children and hopefully grandchildren someday. You really need to look at the BIG picture! The streams, lakes and land in the area are beautiful and so many of us want to enjoy them for years to come. As I sit here writing this I am not only troubled but deeply saddened by what you have proposed. I am extremely troubled by the potential impact on our water resources. This will also have a detrimental effect for years to come on Pleasant Lake, which in the past several years or so has already been experiencing low water levels as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands.

I understand that the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the huge number of high capacity wells that are already in existence today, however the agency's position of purely ignoring these cumulative impacts is one of absolute disappointment. I ask the DNR to address more thoroughly the cumulative impacts as this area is located where it is highly irrigated. The studies have proved that the high capacity wells within this region have now led to huge reductions in the water quantity in the Central Sands region of Wisconsin. I strongly urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

Thank You for your time.

Mary Kay (Noble) Spataro

From: [Mary Clark](#)
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Subject: Richfield Dairy
Date: Sunday, January 06, 2013 1:14:37 PM

My husband and I, and our family, are deeply concerned regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy. We fear the potential impact to the already receding lakes and streams in our area and also the impact to the wetlands NW of the site.

We are in our 80's, and will perhaps not feel the impact of this proposed new well on our environment, but our children and grandchildren surely will, and so we urge you to deny this request by the Richfield Dairy to go ahead with their plans for high capacity wells in this area. We are also concerned for the hundreds of permanent residents and recreational visitors who add to the economic well being of our community!

Thank you for considering our request!

Kelly and Mary Clark
W11777 County Road GG
Hancock, WI 54943

From: [Linda Kwiatkowski](#)
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Subject: Richfield Dairy/Milksource High Capacity Wells
Date: Sunday, January 06, 2013 7:05:18 PM

Dear Ms. Greve,

I am compelled to contact you to share my very strong concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy. I care deeply and am concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche aCri Creek and other creek, and especially on Pleasant Lake. These have long been clean and wonderful water resources in the Central Sands area. They are Wisconsin treasures and the DNR has NOT properly evaluated the potential cumulative effect the proposed wells will have. In fact, I understand the DNR has stated, contrary to water studies done, that there will be no significant impact. To support such inaccuracy is an injustice. Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that *no significant* impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. In light of all other evidence, and in combination of the many other wells in the area, *significant* is a matter of interpretation. As an individual property owner who enjoys the use of these waters, these impacts are in fact significant!

There are already way too many high capacity wells in the Central Sands region. The wells have "grown" exponentially in the last 20 years and have already had a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake's water levels for several consecutive years. While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is one of profound disappointment. I implore the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts as this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state. I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity wells based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the wells. The people of Wisconsin will not ignore that a state agency whose mission statement says it will protect our precious resources seems to willfully chose action contrary to the environment.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Linda Kwiatkowski

From: mtews@earthlink.net
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Subject: Richfield High Capacity Wells
Date: Sunday, January 06, 2013 6:00:22 PM

Rachel,

As a cottage-owner on Pleasant Lake in Waushara County, I want to express my deep concern and opposition to the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy. The water levels on Pleasant Lake, as well as other nearby lakes and streams, have been going down for the past several years; most likely because of the many high capacity wells already in this region.

Now the Richfield Dairy is requesting the DNR's approval to pump 72 MGY, and the DNR states that no significant impacts would occur. Studies have proven that, in combination with other high-capacity wells in this area, this would lead to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region. No longer would I, or other owners of property on lakes and streams in this area, be able to swim, ski, and fish; and the value of our property would be greatly reduced.

I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity wells.

Marilyn Tews

From: [carol](#)
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Subject: the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy
Date: Sunday, January 06, 2013 9:35:14 PM

Rachel,

I want to express my deep concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy. I am specifically concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche a Cri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and Tagatz Creek as well as Pleasant Lake. The wells also will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake has already been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern. Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that no *significant* impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. In light of all other evidence and in combination of the many other wells in the area, *significant* is a matter of interpretation.

While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of **ignoring these cumulative impacts** is one of profound disappointment. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state. I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

It's about time that the DNR do their jobs and protect our natural resources – this is not about big money - this is about protecting our natural resources which we will not be able to re-coop once they are gone – (Little Plover River). We are in the process of trying to stop WY SOCKI Family Farms from implementing their CAFO in Saratoga --- again the soils are permeable, the creeks, rivers and lakes will all be impacted.

It is mind boggling that we even have to be fighting these issues when it is common sense that if you continue to take and do not return (greed) you will have nothing. Why the DNR does not look at the total of high capacity wells as a whole just does not make any sense. Just as it does not make any sense, why the WFF is allowed to implement another CAFO when their existing one has so many violations. The biggest violation is one of the DNR granting them a five year permit to continue with their operation.

WFF is not the only CAFO -- when are they going to have to be responsible for their

actions???? When is the DNR going to step up and put politics aside and fight for the people who live in the areas of these CAFO's???

Thank you for your time,

Regards,

Carol Janik

Protect Wood County Org

From: [Cecilia Hardacker](#)
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Subject: URGENT! Re:Richfield Dairy.
Date: Monday, January 07, 2013 9:50:16 AM

Ms. Greve,

I want to express my deep concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy.

I am specifically concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche a Cri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and Tagatz Creek as well as Pleasant Lake. I am troubled by the potential impact to Little Roche a Cri and Fordham Creeks which are both Exceptional Resource Waters, and Chaffee and Tagatz Creeks which are Outstanding Resource Waters. The wells also will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake which has already been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern.

Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that no **significant** impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. This is not logical. In light of all other evidence, and in combination of the many other wells in the area, **significant** is a matter of interpretation. As an individual who enjoys the use of these waters, these impacts are in fact significant!

While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is one of profound disappointment. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state.

I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

Sincerely,

Cecilia T. Hardacker
8142 Cuyler Ave.
Berwyn, IL 60402

From: [Susan Turner](#)
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Cc: [Bob Clarke](#); [William Iwen](#)
Subject: Water is not a "free" commodity
Date: Sunday, January 06, 2013 11:11:55 AM

Dear Rachel Greve,

Because of the drought experiences we have witnessed this past summer and fall, I want to express my deep concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy.

Even with the present snow cover, there is still a continuing drought. High capacity wells are just an insult to injury.

I am specifically concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche aCri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and Tagatz Creek as well as Pleasant Lake. I am troubled by the potential impact to Little Roche a Cri and FordhamCreeks which are both Exceptional Resource Waters, and Chaffee and TagatzCreeks which are Outstanding Resource Waters. The wells also will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake, which has been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern. Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that no *significant* impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. In light of all other evidence, and in combination of the many other wells in the area, *significant* is a matter of interpretation. As a tourist who enjoys the use of these waters, these impacts are in fact significant!

Water is being used as a bargaining chip to entice big businesses to locate to Wisconsin from other drought riddled states out West. Water is not to be treated as a free commodity, and therefore should be taxed for operations withdrawing 400,000 gallons or more per day. A tax scale can be designed to help offset the expense "others" become burdened with as they re-drill wells that go dry, or dredge lake shores, marinas and beaches that cannot be used for eco-tourism purposes in their present condition. Algae is not to be used as a welcome mat....Tourism= Job Creation.

I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state. I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

Sincerely,

Susan Turner

415 Park Ave.

Warren, IL. 61087....6 blocks from Wisconsin State Line.

815-745-9013

From: [Scott Froehlke](#)
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Subject: WDNR's Supplemental EA for Richfield Dairy
Date: Monday, January 07, 2013 9:33:42 AM

January 7, 2013

Dear Ms. Greve:

I am a citizen of Marquette County and helping to coordinate the activities of an organization called the Central Sands Water Action Coalition (CSWAC.) This group was formed in 2012 and consists of 11 groups functioning within the six county area which make up Wisconsin central sand's region. Each of these existing groups are committed to some aspect of natural resource protection or promotion. CSWAC's overall mission to promote sustainable groundwater policies for the Central Sands region consisting of Portage, Wood, Adams, Waupaca, Marquette and Waushara Counties.

CSWAC has reviewed comments offered by the Pleasant Lake Management District (PMLD) and the River Alliance of Wisconsin in response to the Department's Supplemental EA on the proposed high capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy and we support the concerns, criticisms and assertions made in those communications. Specifically, we urge the DNR to engage in a more vigorous assessment of the cumulative impacts that proposed new wells may have on nearby surface waters and wetlands. In offering this request we also want to draw attention to the unanimous 2011 state Supreme Court Lake Buelah decision which requires the DNR to consider the environmental impacts associated with pumping large quantities of groundwater. In order to meet these newly defined responsibilities, we believe the DNR needs to approach its new mandate in a thorough, holistic and reasonable manner. By considering the impacts of only one well, and ignoring the 90 or more additional high capacity wells within 4 miles of the requested new well, the DNR is engaging in an abrogation of its duties under the Public Trust Doctrine.

CSWAC has a second major point of concern that is relevant in this situation and also has an impact on the coalition's broader groundwater agenda for the Central Sands. The EA asserts (we think wrongly) that no significant environmental impacts will result from the permitting of the Dairy's high capacity well request --- but the EA only addresses the Dairy's requested initial pumping rate. Our concern is for the potential impacts of increased pumping rates in the future. In fact, the history of groundwater use in Central Wisconsin suggests increases in pumping rates will be on the horizon, and a thorough assessment of these potential impacts must be addressed. Failing that, a new policy must emerge requiring that a high capacity well cannot increase its pumping rates beyond its originally permitted level..

Thank you, Ms. Greve, for the opportunity to comment. The emergence of CSWAC is only one example of a radically changing perception in Wisconsin that our current high capacity well regulations in Wisconsin are not meeting the high traditions of resource protection in our state. Throughout Central Wisconsin we are seeing a landscape (or more accurately) waterscape that is undergoing radical deleterious changes that are manmade and go beyond natural water fluxuations and impacts of global warming. There is, as they say. water missing from our landscape and citizens are demanding its reclamation and, in the future, a groundwater apportionment strategy that will insure healthy lakes, streams and wetlands.

Sincerely,

Scott Froehlke
CSWAC Coordinator

From: [Marcee Gavula](#)
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Subject: Wells / Richfield Dairy
Date: Sunday, January 06, 2013 11:10:02 PM

Ms. Greve,

I want to express my deep concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy.

I am specifically concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche a Cri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and Tagatz Creek as well as Pleasant Lake. I am troubled by the potential impact to Little Roche a Cri and Fordham Creeks which are both Exceptional Resource Waters, and Chaffee and Tagatz Creeks which are Outstanding Resource Waters. The wells also will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake which has already been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern.

Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that no **significant** impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. This is not logical. In light of all other evidence, and in combination of the many other wells in the area, **significant** is a matter of interpretation. As an individual who enjoys the use of these waters, these impacts are in fact significant!

While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is one of profound disappointment. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state.

I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

Sincerely,

--

Marcee Gavula
1037 Chicago Ave, Oak Park, IL 60302
708-790-1381 (cell)
312-592-6699 (fax)

From: [john.clarke](#)
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Subject: wells
Date: Sunday, January 06, 2013 7:00:13 AM

Ms. Greve:

I have been watching in frustration the developments in the permitting of the wells for the Richfield Dairy and have several concerns. We have enjoyed many years on Pleasant Lake as our family owns property on the lake. I have seen the long-term effects of continual decline in water levels. I am specifically concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche a Cri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and Tagatz Creek as well as Pleasant Lake. I am troubled by the potential impact to Little Roche a Cri and Fordham Creeks which are both Exceptional Resource Waters, and Chaffee and Tagatz Creeks which are Outstanding Resource Waters. The wells also will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake which has already been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern. Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52MGY and yet the DNR states that no *significant* impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72MGY. In light of all other evidence, and in combination of the many other wells in the area, *significant* is a matter of interpretation.

While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is one of profound disappointment. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state. I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,

John Clarke
Louisburg, KS

From: [Sue Pils](#)
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Subject: wells-Richford Dairy
Date: Sunday, January 06, 2013 6:01:53 PM

Ms. Greve,

I want to express my deep concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy.

I am specifically concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche a Cri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and Tagatz Creek as well as Pleasant Lake. I am troubled by the potential impact to Little Roche a Cri and Fordham Creeks which are both Exceptional Resource Waters, and Chaffee and Tagatz Creeks which are Outstanding Resource Waters. The wells also will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake which has already been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern.

Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that no **significant** impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. This is not logical. In light of all other evidence, and in combination of the many other wells in the area, **significant** is a matter of interpretation. As an individual who enjoys the use of these waters, these impacts are in fact significant!

While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is one of profound disappointment. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state.

I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

Sincerely,

Al and Sue Pils

N4025 7th Lane
Hancock, WI 54943

January 6, 2013

Dear Ms. Greve,

I want to express my very deep concerns regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy in Adams County Wisconsin.

I am mostly concerned about the impact that the wells will have on nearby waters especially Pleasant Lake. The wells, if approved, will add to the already detrimental effect of the very low water levels that we have experiencing for several consecutive years. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern.

Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that no *significant* impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. How can this be a logical conclusion? In light of the evidence previously provided, and in combination of the many other wells in the area, *significant* seems to have different meanings for different people. As an individual who enjoys the use of these waters, these impacts are in fact truly significant!

Why would the DNR who has the obligation to protect the waters of Wisconsin approve new high capacity wells? I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts in this region and to make the educated decision of denying the application for another high capacity well.

Sincerely,

Lynn Foerstel

N 215 4th Ave., Westfield, WI 53964

foersteldds@aol.com

January 7, 2013

Rachel.Greve@wisconsin.gov

Dear Ms. Greve:

As a property owner on Pleasant Lake, I am writing to protest the high capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy, just west of Pleasant Lake. It is likely that this farm and these wells **will negatively affect the water quantity of the lake**. I know you agree that Wisconsin lakes are some of our greatest resources and should be preserved, managed and protected.

These high-capacity wells and farm will likely exacerbate current issues and could destroy property values:

1. Pleasant Lake is already at its lowest lake level since recorded levels were established in 1964.
2. Another Waushara County lake, Long Lake, experienced a similar issue and is now dry. Per the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, "water siphoned for high-capacity wells and agriculture irrigation" was a "factor".
3. Pleasant Lake already dramatically feels the effect of droughts and irrigation and adding a nearly limitless high-capacity well would be disastrous.

Please do not approve these high capacity wells. In the event that the wells do have a detrimental effect, we would ask that your agency take the necessary measures to restore the lake to its pre CAFO status.

Sincerely,

Jeff Meyer
Property Owner, Pleasant Lake
jeffcmeyer@charter.net

N151 4th Ave
Coloma, WI

c/o 19 Paget Road
Madison, WI 53704

January 7, 2013

Rachel.Greve@wisconsin.gov

Dear Ms. Greve:

Our natural resources are our greatest gift. It is with this sentiment that I write this letter voicing my concern about the proposed high capacity well at the Richfield Dairy farm in Adams County, 2.7 miles west of Pleasant Lake.

We have had the joy of being a property owner on Pleasant Lake for 8 years. We have watched the ducks, geese and even bald eagles fly overhead. We have enjoyed swimming and boating in the pristine spring-fed waters.

We believe the high capacity wells **will negatively affect** the lake in a dramatic way. The addition of these high capacity wells has the potential to further drop our lake level, which is at the lowest it has been since record-keeping began in 1964. Local farm irrigation and droughts already influence the lake so these high-capacity wells will likely be catastrophic.

Please do not approve the high capacity wells. At a minimum, limits for the well capacity should be set to preserve and protect our lake.

Sincerely,

Heidi Meyer
Property Owner, Pleasant Lake
N151 4th Ave
Coloma WI

hameyer@charter.net

From: [Brenner, Willard C.](#)
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Subject: High Capacity Wells - Richfield Dairy
Date: Monday, January 07, 2013 5:37:35 PM
Attachments: [Willard C. Brenner.vcf](#)

Dear Ms. Greve:

I want to express my deep concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy. I am specifically concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche a Cri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and Tagatz Creek as well as **Pleasant Lake**. I am troubled by the potential impact to Little Roche a Cri and Fordham Creeks which are both Exceptional Resource Waters, and Chaffee and Tagatz Creeks which are Outstanding Resource Waters. The wells also will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake which has already been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern. Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that no *significant* impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. In light of all other evidence, and in combination of the many other wells in the area, *significant* is a matter of interpretation. As an individual property owner who enjoys the use of these waters, these impacts are in fact significant!

While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is one of profound disappointment. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state. I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

In closing, I would like to share with you my displeasure of the stance the DNR has taken on this issue. As a property owner on Pleasant Lake, I assumed that your organization would PROTECT the natural resources (ie. lakes, streams, etc.) of the state of Wisconsin. I have not read your mission statement but surely it does not include the DESTRUCTION OF NATURAL RESOURCES. It is simply appalling that you do not take into consideration the WHOLE EFFECT of the many wells in this area! What other way could you possibly use to access the impact it will have?

Best Regards,

Willard C. Brenner

Vice Chairman

(815) 637-7020 Office

(815) 540-7649 Cell

wbrenner@riversidecommunity.com

6855 E. Riverside Blvd.
Rockford, IL 61114



 PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT BEFORE PRINTING THIS EMAIL

This message and accompanying documents are covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. " 2510-2521, and contain information intended for the specified individual(s) only. This information is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, or an agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, copying, or the taking of any action based on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify bbrenner@riversidecommunity.com immediately by e-mail, and delete the original message.

From: heidi@teamlblonde.com
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)
Subject: Richfield dairy permit
Date: Monday, January 07, 2013 8:17:18 AM
Attachments: [winmail.dat](#)

Ms. Greve,

I want to express my deep concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy.

I am specifically concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche a Cri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and Tagatz Creek as well as Pleasant Lake. I am troubled by the potential impact to Little Roche a Cri and Fordham Creeks which are both Exceptional Resource Waters, and Chaffee and Tagatz Creeks which are Outstanding Resource Waters. The wells also will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake which has already been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern.

Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that no significant impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. This is not logical.

While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is one of profound disappointment. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state.

I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

Sincerely,
Heidi Vance